

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated February 3, 2010. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Claims 1-22, 24-30, 32-47, 72-75, 77-80, and 82-84 remain in this application. Claims 23, 71, 76, and 81 are canceled by this amendment. Claims 31 and 48-70 were previously canceled.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that claims 1-19 and 32-45 are allowed. The Examiner further stated that claims 23, 71, 76 and 81 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 1-19 and 32-45 are allowed and for indicating that claims 23, 71, 76 and 81 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. The Applicant has amended independent claims 20, 47, 75 and 80 to incorporate the limitations from allowed dependent claims 23, 71, 76, and 81 respectively. Accordingly, dependent claims 23, 71, 76, and 81 have been canceled. Claim 46 has also been amended to include limitations similar to those of allowed dependent claim 71. Since claims 21-22, 24-30, 72-74, 77-79, and 82-84 depend from amended claims 20, 47, 75 and 80, respectively, the Applicant submits that all of the remaining claims 1-22, 24-30, 32-47, 72-75, 77-80, and 82-84 are in condition for allowance.

***Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112***

In the Office Action, claim 78 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “sending to the second processor,” as recited in lines 2-3 of claim 78. The Applicant has amended claim 78 to correct for the antecedent basis problem. The Applicant respectfully requests that in light of these amendments and remarks the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claim 78 under 35 USC 112.

***Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103***

In the Office Action claims 20-22, 24-30, 47, 72-74, 80, 82-84 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer III et al. (USPN 6,654,373) (hereinafter "Mayer") in view of Scholten (USPN 7,126,956) (hereinafter "Scholten") and Rajkumar et al. (USPN 7,391,769) (hereinafter "Rajkumar"). Claim 46 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Scholten. Claims 75 and 77-79 were rejected as rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer in view of Rajkumar. Since claims 20-22, 24-30, 46, 47, 72-75, 77-80, 82-84 have all been amended to be in condition for allowance, the Applicant submits that this rejection has been overcome. The Applicant respectfully requests that in light of these amendments and remarks the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 20-22, 24-30, 46, 47, 72-75, 77-80, 82-84 under 35 USC 103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jesus Del Castillo/

Jesus Del Castillo  
Reg. No. 51,604

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
JDC:gjs  
62465655 v1